Rt. 12, Frederick, Md. 21701
9/9/75

Mr. Paul Rothermel, Jr.
2406 Little Creek Drive
Richardson, Tx. 75080

Dear Paul,

Your note of the fith and the enclosed clipping came today. Thanks.

You raise two separate interesting questions,

Will Percy take the stand and

Will someone try to get an immunity grant.

I've been enough of a Percy watcher to say that onx a question like this he is likely to be unpredictable. There are facets to his character and record that permit arguing both ways. Without considering him candidate for the secon part.

However, unless there is something wrong with the jury he should be convicted. It then depends on how he figures it, beginning with how he figures the jury.

He is capable of coming up with a medical argument hoked up some way to make it appear he wasn't himself. He might even refer to his win in damages against Bluebonnet, where he claimed partial and as I recall intermittent incapacity and pain no mere mortal could bear.

There are minor figures, comparatively, who have for all practical purposes already confessed, as I understand what they've said publicly.

However, from what I know of the fact as distinguished from the law the government, were this an ordinary case, would need no inside witness. I can visualize some technicalities that could hurt the government's chances. This is one of the reasons I wish I knew more about the actualities of the situation and where all directly and indirectly involved are and how they feel.

My own feeling is that Percy has been wanting justice for many years and justice has been suffering from him longer. The others are strangers to me and mean nothing to me. They didn't do to me what they did to you. However, they also made others suffer and I believe there should be some restitution. Particularly because there could be no sum one could inagine that would hurt them at all.

There has been a radio newsitem I hope you spot in the papers. The new story is that Oswald was going to bomb the hell out of Dallas - and that the FBI kept this secret all the time they were building a case of proclivity toward violence against this same Oswald. He they ran the risk of insinuating that he had shot at Walker when they had proof he hadn't, just to be able to allege this tendency.

Do you suppose this deficiency is what they were trying to overcome in making cross-sections and microscopic examination of his pubic hair?

Best regards,